UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/748,085	12/20/2000	David Arthur Eatough	42390P9719	4345

7590 09/22/2004

Paul A. Mendonsa
BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP
7th Floor
12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, CA 90025

EXAMINER
TON, ANTHONY T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2661	

DATE MAILED: 09/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *17 June 2004*.

2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☐ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) *1-17* is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on *18 June 2004* is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

PHIRIN SAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTIONS

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

2.   **Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over **Orfali et al. (US Publication**: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999, Pages 127-201, Third

Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) (provided by **IDS #5**) in view of **Franklin et al.**

(US patent No. **6,125,352**) hereinafter referred to as **Orfali** and **Franklin**, respectively.

   a) **In Regarding to Claim 1: Orfali disclosed** a method comprising:

generating a packet *(see Fig. 7-14: step 1, order)* in response to a predetermined event

(see page 155: step 1, Jeri places an order; and see page 146 and Fig. 7-8);

storing the packet *(see Fig. 7-14: the process between steps 1 and 2, and see page 155:*

step 2, merchant's server program (hence, the packet is storing at Merchant's location before

forwarding to the Bank via the step 2));

forwarding the packet with a local client messaging application to a server messaging

application on a server *(see Fig. 7-14: step 2 (hence, forwarding the packet), and see page 155, in*

step 1: an electronic shopping card enclosed her encrypted credit card number (hence, a local

client messaging application), in which the merchant is considered as a client server; and see

page 146 and Fig. 7-8) via a network connection managed by the client messaging application

(see Fig. 7-14: the cloud network covering the steps 2 and 5); and

dispatching the packet with the server messaging application *(see Fig. 7-14: step 3, and*

see page 155, in step 3: if the card is still OK and if Jeri has enough credit to cover the

transaction (hence, the server messaging application), in which the Bank is a messaging server;

and see page 146 and Fig. 7-8) messaging handler on the server that processes the packet *(see*

Fig. 7-14: it is inherently there is a server to process VISA and Master Card).

Orfali failed to explicitly disclose generating a packet **with a local application** and

storing the packet **locally**.

Franklin clearly disclosed such generating a packet **with a local application** and storing

the packet **locally** *(see col. 11 lines 44-55 and col. 13 lines 5-35; abstract; and Fig. 1: Web*

Browser 120 and commerce client 122 located at the consumer computer 102).

At the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine such generating a packet **with a local application** and storing the packet **locally**, as

taught by Franklin with Orfali, so that a merchant can conveniently store relatively static catalog

information as HTML documents. **The motivation** for doing so would have been to provide

product information that may be stored and served in format recognized only by a specialized

client *(see Franklin, col. 13 lines 36-52).* Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Franklin with Orfali in the invention as specified in the claim.

b) **In Regarding to Claim 4: Orfali further disclosed** the method of claim 1 further

comprising:

generating an acknowledge message in response to the packet being dispatched to the

messaging handler *(see Fig. 7-14: OK (an acknowledge message) on step 5; and step 4 (in*

response to the packet being dispatched to the messaging handler)); and

communicating the acknowledge message from the messaging server application to the

messaging client application *(see Fig. 7-14: step 5)*.

   c) **In Regarding to Claim 6: Orfali disclosed** an article comprising:

   generating a packet *(see Fig. 7-14: step 1)* in response to a predetermined event *(see page

155: step 1, Jeri places an order; and see page 146 and Fig. 7-8)*;

   storing the packet *(see Fig. 7-14: the process between steps 1 and 2, and see page 155:*

step 2, merchant's server program (hence, the packet is storing at Merchant's location before

forwarding to the Bank via the step 2));

   forwarding the packet with a local client messaging application to a server messaging

application on a server *(see Fig. 7-14: step 2 (hence, forwarding the packet), and see page 155, in*

step 1: an electronic shopping card enclosed her encrypted credit card number (hence, a local

client messaging application), in which the merchant is considered as a client server; and see

page 146 and Fig. 7-8) via a network connection managed by the client messaging application

(see Fig. 7-14: the cloud network covering the steps 2 and 5); and

   dispatching the packet with the server messaging application *(see Fig. 7-14: step 3, and*

see page 155, in step 3: if the card is still OK and if Jeri has enough credit to cover the

transaction (hence the server messaging application), in which the Bank is a messaging server;

and see page 146 and Fig. 7-8) a messaging handler on the server that processes the packet *(see*

Fig. 7-14: it is inherently there is a server to process VISA and Master Card).

   Orfali failed to explicitly disclose generating a packet **with a local application** and

storing the packet **locally**.

Franklin clearly disclosed such generating a packet **with a local application** and storing

the packet **locally** *(see col.11 lines 44-55 and col.13 lines 5-35; abstract; and Fig.1: Web*

Browser 120 and commerce client 122 located at the consumer computer 102).

At the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine such generating a packet **with a local application** and storing the packet **locally**, as

taught by Franklin with Orfali, so that a merchant can conveniently store relatively static catalog

information as HTML documents. **The motivation** for doing so would have been to provide

product information that may be stored and served in format recognized only by a specialized

client *(see Franklin, col.13 lines 36-52).* Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Franklin with Orfali in the invention as specified in the claim.

d) **In Regarding to Claim 9**: **Orfali further disclosed** the article of claim 6 further

comprising:

generating an acknowledge message in response to the packet being dispatched to the

messaging handler *(see Fig.7-14: OK (an acknowledge message) on step 5; and step 4 (in*

response to the packet being dispatched to the messaging handler)); and

communicating the acknowledge message from the messaging server application to the

messaging client application *(see Fig.7-14: step 5).*

e) **In Regarding to Claim 11**: **Orfali disclosed** a computer data signal comprising:

generating a packet *(see Fig.7-14: step 1)* in response to a predetermined event *(see page*

155: step 1, Jeri places an order; and see page 146 and Fig.7-8);

storing the packet *(see Fig. 7-14: the process between steps 1 and 2, and see page 155:*

step 2, merchant's server program (hence, the packet is storing at Merchant's location before

forwarding to the Bank via the step 2));

forwarding the packet with a local client messaging application to a server messaging

application on a server *(see Fig. 7-14: step 2 (hence, forwarding the packet), and see page 155, in*

step 1: an electronic shopping card enclosed her encrypted credit card number (hence, a local

client messaging application), in which the merchant is a client server; and see page 146 and

Fig. 7-8) via a network connection managed by the client messaging application *(see Fig. 7-14:*

the cloud network covering the steps 2 and 5); and

dispatching the packet with the server messaging application *(see Fig. 7-14: step 3, and*

see page 155, in step 3: if the card is still OK and if Jeri has enough credit to cover the

transaction (hence the server messaging application), in which the Bank is a messaging server;

and see page 146 and Fig. 7-8) a messaging handler on the server that processes the packet *(see*

Fig. 7-14: it is inherently there is a server to process VISA and Master Card).

Orfali failed to explicitly disclose generating a packet **with a local application** and

storing the packet **locally**.

Franklin clearly disclosed such generating a packet **with a local application** and storing

the packet **locally** *(see col. 11 lines 44-55 and col. 13 lines 5-35; abstract; and Fig. 1: Web*

Browser 120 and commerce client 122 located at the consumer computer 102).

At the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

combine such generating a packet **with a local application** and storing the packet **locally**, as

taught by Franklin with Orfali, so that a merchant can conveniently store relatively static catalog

information as HTML documents. **The motivation** for doing so would have been to provide

product information that may be stored and served in format recognized only by a specialized

client *(see Franklin, col.13 lines 36-52)*. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Franklin with Orfali in the invention as specified in the claim.

   f) **In Regarding to Claim 14: Orfali further disclosed** the computer data signal of

claim 11 further comprising:

   generating an acknowledge message in response to the packet being dispatched to the

messaging handler *(see Fig.7-14: OK (an acknowledge message) on step 5; and step 4 (in*

response to the packet being dispatched to the messaging handler)); and

   communicating the acknowledge message from the messaging server application to the

messaging client application *(see Fig.7-14: step 5)*.

3.   **Claims 2, 7 and 12** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Orfali et al. (US Publication: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999, Pages 127-201, Third

Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) in view of **Franklin et al.** (US patent No.

6,125,352) as applied to claims 1, 6, and 11 above, and further in view of **Renouard et al.** (US

Patent No. **6,161,123**) hereinafter referred to as **Renouard**.

   Orfali disclosed all subject matters of these claims 2, 7 and 12 as set forth in claims 1, 6

and 11, respectively.

   Orfali failed to explicitly disclose a packet, which includes a target identifier and a

variable length data field.

Renouard clearly taught such a packet, which includes a target identifier and a variable length data field *(see col.3 lines 28-29: an identifier of the destination; and see col.11 lines 21-27: a variable length data field 1020 used for transmitting data in the messages)*.

At the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine such a packet, which includes a target identifier and a variable length data field, as taught by Renouard with Orfali in order to distinguish a destination as well as transmitting a data packet in a different length. **The motivation** for doing so would have been to provide a successful transfer to an appropriate destination of different remote servers. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Renouard with Orfali in the invention as specified in the claims.

4.   **Claims 5, 10 and 15** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Orfali et al.** (US Publication: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999, Pages 127-201, Third Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) in view of **Franklin et al.** (US patent No. 6,125,352) as applied to claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 11, and 14 above, and further in view of **Trenbeath et al.** (US Patent No. 6,324,587) hereinafter referred to as **Trenbeath.**

Orfali disclosed all subject matters of these claims 5; 10; and 15 as set forth in claims 1 and 4; 6 and 9; and 11 and 14; respectively.

Orfali failed to explicitly disclose the method, the article, and computer data signal further comprising dropping the packet from the local storage in response to the acknowledge message being received by the messaging client application.

Trenbeath explicitly disclosed such dropping the packet from the local storage in response to the acknowledge message being received by the messaging client application *(see*

col.6 lines 32-56, a particular data object may be included in a store and forward message and later be removed from that message during processing, the data object refers to data messages).

At the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine such dropping the packet from the local storage in response to the acknowledge message being received by the messaging client application, as taught by Trenbeath with Orfali in order to save memory for a storage in a client system. **The motivation** for doing so would have been to execute a program faster since more memory available for such a storage. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Trenbeath with Orfali in the invention as specified in the claims.

5.   **Claims 3, 8 and 13** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Orfali et al.** (US Publication: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999, Pages 127-201, Third Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) in view of **Franklin et al.** (US patent No. **6,125,352**) and **Renouard et al.** (US Patent No. **6,161,123**) as applied to claims 1, 2, 6, 7, 11 and 12 above, and further in view of **Verkler et al.** (US Patent No. **6,157,941**) hereinafter referred to as **Verkler**.

      Orfali further disclosed wherein the message server application selects a messaging handler from a plurality of messaging handlers based on the target identifier *(see Fig. 7-14: Bank (message server application); step 3 specifically pointed to VISA (a messaging handler); VISA and Master Card (a plurality of messaging handlers)).*

      Renouard disclosed the target identifier as described in the Claim 2 above.

Orfali failed to explicitly teach _selects_ a messaging handler from a plurality of messaging

handlers _**based on**_ the target identifier.

Verkler clearly taught such a selection _(see Fig.2 and col.9 lines 24-32: Agent event_

manager 401 handles messages by running one of message handlers 402-404).

At the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

provide such a selection based on the target identification of a handler throughout the VISA and

Master Card of Orfali, as taught by Verkler in order to select an appropriate destination of server.

The motivation for doing so would have been to make Orfali more efficient. Therefore, it would

have been obvious to combine Verkler with Orfali in the invention as specified in the claims.

6.   **Claims 16 and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Orfali**

et al. (US Publication: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999, Pages 127-201, Third Edition,

Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) in view of **Akatsu et al.** (US Patent No. **6,496,862**)

hereinafter referred to as **Akatsu**.

a) **In Regarding to Claim 16: Orfali disclosed** a network architecture comprising:

a client electronic system having one or more processors to run one or more programs

and a memory system coupled to the processor, the memory system to store one or more

message packets _(see page 146: paragraph Wait for Standards and Fig.7-8: On client side),_

wherein the one or more processors also runs a messaging client that forwards message packets

stored in the memory system; and

a server electronic system coupled to the client electronic system, the server electronic

system having one or more processors to run one or more programs in a memory system coupled

to the processor, wherein the one or more processors runs a messaging server that receives

forwarded messages from the messaging client and dispatches the forwarded messages to a

messaging handler on the server which processes the messages in a predetermined manner *(see*

Fig.7-8: Server 1 to server 4 and client; and Fig.7-14: wherein the Bank dispatches the

forwarded messages to the Visa Master Card (messaging handler),which would run programs

(message packets) to clarify the status (predetermined manner) of the Customer Jeri).

Orfali failed to clearly disclose wherein the one or more processors also runs a

messaging client that forwards message packets stored in the memory system.

Akatsu clearly disclosed such wherein the one or more processors also runs a messaging

client that forwards message packets stored in the memory system *(see Fig.24: 2700 (messaging*

client); and see col.3 lines 49-53: forwarding the output data packet to the external network; and

see col.7 line 60 – col.8 line 29: CPU, volatile memory).

At the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill in the art to

provide such wherein the one or more processors also runs a messaging client that forwards

message packets stored in the memory system throughout the fundamental framework of Orfali,

as taught by Akatsu for a purpose of hardware implementation. **The motivation** for doing so

would have been to provide an appropriate hardware to an electronic shopping and payment

infrastructure system of Orfali. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Akatsu with

Orfali in the invention as specified in the claim.

b) **In Regarding to Claim 17:** the claimed subject matters of the claim 17 are the same

as that of the claim 16, **except for** a second client electronic system, coupled to the server

electronic system. However, **Orfali also disclosed** such a second client electronic system,

coupled to the server electronic system *(see Fig.7-8: client 1 to client 4 that coupled to*

Authentication Server and Server 1 to Server 4).

Therefore, at the time of the invention, **it would be obvious** to a person of ordinary skill

in the art to provide such wherein the one or more processors also runs a messaging client that

forwards message packets stored in the memory system throughout the fundamental framework

of Orfali, as taught by Akatsu for a purpose of hardware implementation. **The motivation** for

doing so would have been to provide an appropriate hardware to an electronic shopping and

payment infrastructure system of Orfali. Thus, it would have been obvious to combine Akatsu

with Orfali in the invention as specified in the claim.

Response to Remarks

7.   Applicant's arguments with respect to **claims 1-18** amended on **06/17/2004** have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections:

8.   **Claims 1, 6, and 11 were rejected** under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as being unpatentable over

Orfali et al. (US Publication: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999, Pages 127-201, Third

Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA).

However, the Applicants amended these claims to emphasize **a local application** and

server. Therefore, these **Claims 1, 6, and 11 are now being rejected** under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as

being unpatentable over **Orfali et al. (US Publication**: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999,

Pages 127-201, Third Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) in view of **Franklin et al.**

(US patent No. **6,125,352**) as described above.

Even though the Applicants amended the claims 1, 6 and 11 to emphasize a packet that is generated and stored **locally**, *Franklin* has disclosed such a packet as described in the section 2 above.

According to the disclosure of *Orfali* in **page 155**, after Jeri places and order "she fills up an electronic shopping cart, populates the form, electronically sign it, and encloses her encrypted credit card number. Eventually, and this will be done via drag-and-drop" *(hence, Jeri generated a packet via a local messaging application),* she sends the electronic shopping cart *(packet)* to the Merchant *(see step 1 in Fig. 7-14)*, the Merchant passes *(forwards)* the authorization to the bank *(see step 2 in Fig. 7-14)* via a network *(see the cloud network that covers the steps 2 and 5 in Fig. 7-14)*. The bank decrypts the credit card number and checks Jeri's signature *(hence, banks' server)*.

By the above manners, *Orfali* has disclosed a packet was generated via the local messaging application since she fills up an electronic shopping cart, populates the form, electronically signs it, and encloses her encrypted credit card number, and the Merchant forwarded the electronic shopping cart to the bank *(hence, the bank's server)* so that the bank may decrypt the credit card number and check Jeri's signature.

In Fig.7-14, *Orfali* does not clearly disclose what computer application Jeri uses, nor do the Applicants claim any subject matter that relates to what computer application the Applicants have used.

For these above reasons, the **claims 1, 6 and 11** are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over **Orfali et al. (US Publication**: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999,

Pages 127-201, Third Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) in view of **Franklin et al.**

(US patent No. **6,125,352**) as described in this Office Action.

9.   **Claims 4, 9, and 14** are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Orfali et al. (US Publication: "Client/Server Survival Guide", 1999, Pages 127-201, Third

Edition, Publisher: John Wiley & Sons, USA) in view of **Franklin et al.** (US patent No.

6,125,352) for the same reasons of the claims 1, 6, 11 and in the section 2 as described above.

10.   **Claims Rejections – 35 U.S.C. 103(a)**

        Claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13 and 15: According to the previous Office Action, these

claims were rejected under **35 U.S.C. 103(a)** as being unpatentable over *Orfali et al.* in view of

Renouard et al. (for claims 2, 7 and 12), *Trenbeath et al.* (for claims 5, 10 and 15), and further

in view of *Verkler et al.* (for claims 3, 8 and 13).   However, Applicant mentioned *Orfali* **only.**

The Applicants is not able to show non-obviousness by <u>attacking references individually</u> where

the rejections are based on combinations of references, the claims were rejected in a combination

of at least two different Prior Arts, not every limitation of the claims can be disclosed by *Orfali.*

See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091,

231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

        Furthermore, claims 5, 10 and 15 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Orfali* in view

of **Trenbeath et al.** (US Patent No. 6,324,587). Even though *Trenbeath* does teach the principle

of removing a data attached to or associated with the message, *Trenbeath* also does teach the

principle of removing a message *(see col.6 lines 32-38 and lines 47-56)*. In which, *Trenbeath*

disclosed a **particular data object** may be included in a store and forward message and later be

removed from that message during processing, and the term "**data object**" can be referred to any

discretely formatted data that is separately cognizable by a client. Examples of data objects

include, but are not limited to, **data messages**, such as emails, files of all sorts, including text,

images, etc., facsimiles, software objects, etc. *(see col.6 lines 47-56)*. Therefore, *Trenbeath*

disclosed such a removing (dropping) message of the instant claim.

11.   **Claims 16 and 17**:

Claims 16 and 17 have been rejected as being unpatentable over Orfali in view of Akatsu.

The Applicants is not able to show non-obviousness by attacking references individually where

the rejection is based on combinations of references of *Orfali* and *Akatsu*. The rejections of

these two claims are clearly described in the section 6 of this Office Action above.

12.   **Conclusion**

Claims 1-17 have been respectfully traversed and reconsidered. However, for the above

reasons and based upon the rejections above, the claims 1-17 have still been rejected as described

in this Office Action.

13.   Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this

Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).

Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37

CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this

final action.

Examiner Information

14.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to **Anthony T Ton** whose telephone number is **571-272-3076**. The

examiner can normally be reached on M-F: 8:00 am - 4:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, **Ken Vanderpuye** can be reached on **571-272-3078**. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-3076**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

ATT
9/16/04

PHIRIN SAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER